

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
8

9 MARLOS M. MOORE,

10 *Petitioner,*

11 vs.
12

13 BRIAN WILLIAMS, *et al.,*

14 *Respondents.*
15

2:10-cv-00447-KJD-RJJ

ORDER

16 This habeas matter under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 with unexhausted claims comes before
17 the Court on petitioner's motions (## 9 & 10) "for stay and dismissal without prejudice."

18 In its prior order (#8), the Court clearly distinguished between the stay procedure under
19 *Rhines v. Weber*, 544 U.S. 269, 125 S.Ct. 1528, 161 L.Ed.2d 440 (2005), and the entirely
20 different stay procedure under *Kelly v. Small*, 315 F.3d 1063 (9th Cir. 2003). See #8, at 3-5.

21 Among other differences, when a habeas matter is stayed under *Rhines*, the
22 unexhausted claims are **not** dismissed, and the entire petition is stayed while the petitioner
23 returns to state court to exhaust the unexhausted claims. See *King v. Ryan*, 564 F.3d 1133,
24 1139 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied*, __ U.S. __, 130 S.Ct. 214, 175 L.Ed.2d 148 (2009). In contrast,
25 when a habeas matter is stayed under *Kelly*, the unexhausted claims **are** dismissed, the
26 remaining claims are stayed while the petitioner exhausts the dismissed claims, and the
27 petitioner must amend the federal petition after the claims are exhausted if he wishes to again
28 present the claims in federal court. See, e.g., *King*, 564 F.3d at 1138-39.

1 In the present filing, petitioner requests that the Court “grant him a stay in these
2 proceedings and to dismiss Grounds 1 and 3 of his petition, without prejudice,” citing *both*
3 *Rhines* and *Kelly*. Petitioner further provides argument seeking to satisfy, at least in part, the
4 requirements for a *Rhines* stay, which are not required to obtain a *Kelly* stay. Petitioner
5 further states, despite his request earlier in the filing for dismissal of the claims without
6 prejudice, that he “does not wish to voluntarily dismiss these grounds from his petition.”

7 Petitioner must clearly request *either*: (a) a *Rhines* stay; (b) a *Kelly* stay; or (c) a *Rhines*
8 stay or in the alternative a *Kelly* stay. Petitioner is proceeding *pro se*, and his filings are
9 construed liberally. However, the Court cannot apply a rule of liberal construction to resolve
10 an ambiguous request that fails to distinguish between two entirely different stay procedures.
11 The two different stay procedures each have different procedures; each are subject to
12 different requirements as to whether they may be entered in the first instance; and each have
13 different potential consequences when a petitioner later returns to federal court.

14 As the prior order noted, petitioner may request a *Rhines* stay or in the alternative a
15 *Kelly* stay. Petitioner must make such an alternative request clearly, however. Petitioner may
16 not generate an issue for later proceedings by making an ambiguous request that potentially
17 allows for a later argument that the Court did not provide the relief that he sought and/or
18 misled or prejudiced him by granting one alternative rather than the other in response to his
19 ambiguous request.

20 Petitioner, again, instead must clearly and unambiguously request *either*: (a) a *Rhines*
21 stay; (b) a *Kelly* stay; or (c) a *Rhines* stay or in the alternative a *Kelly* stay. If petitioner fails
22 to make a request for appropriate relief, the default rule is that the entire petition then is
23 subject to immediate dismissal as a mixed petition. *See, e.g., Rose v. Lundy*, 455 U.S. 509,
24 102 S.Ct. 1198, 71 L.Ed.2d 379 (1982). Accordingly, if petitioner again presents an
25 ambiguous request that again fails to distinguish between a *Rhines* stay and a *Kelly* stay, the
26 Court simply will dismiss the entire petition for lack of exhaustion.

27 IT THEREFORE IS ORDERED that petitioner’s motions (## 9 & 10) for stay and
28 dismissal are DENIED without prejudice.

1 IT FURTHER IS ORDERED that petitioner shall have thirty (30) days from entry of this
2 order within which to mail to the Clerk for filing either a motion for dismissal without prejudice
3 of the entire petition, for partial dismissal only of Grounds 1 and 3, and/or for other
4 appropriate relief. The entire petition will be dismissed for lack of complete exhaustion if an
5 appropriate motion is not timely filed. If another ambiguous motion is filed, this case will be
6 dismissed without further advance notice.

7 DATED: August 16, 2010

8 
9

10 _____
11 KENT J. DAWSON
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28